



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE EDITOR'S DIARY.

THURSDAY, December 13.

Autocracy or Democracy?

WEDNESDAY, December 12th, 1906, will be recorded in history as the day upon which the most audacious Federal Administration the country has yet known announced a deliberate purpose to effect a complete revolution in the form of our Government that has maintained since the thirteen original States embodied their compact in the Constitution of the Union. On the evening of that day, the Secretary of State, the Honorable Elihu Root, addressing the Pennsylvania Society of the City of New York, administered a stinging rebuke to such commonwealths as, in the judgment of the President and himself, had in their legislation disregarded the interests of the whole people, warned them of the danger to their separate authorities which they had thereby incurred, and served upon them formal notice of the intention of the Administration to obtain new constructions of the Constitution which would vitiate the reliance they have hitherto placed upon that instrument as a safeguard of the rights explicitly reserved in Article X of the ratified amendments. It was a memorable and amazing declaration and fraught with possible consequences so momentous and far-reaching that its full import has not yet reached the comprehension of the people.

The thesis of the Secretary of State comprised three separate *dicta* in logical sequence: (1) A marking of the tendency towards absorption of complete authority by a centralized government; (2) Frank admission of further encroachments upon local powers in contemplation by the Administration; and (3) A positive threat to obtain from the highest judicial tribunal, "sooner or later," constructions of the Constitution that will "vest the power where it will be exercised—in the national Government."

Since Alexander Hamilton failed in his final desperate endeavor to deprive the people of what was then considered to be their

inherent right of local self-government, no statesman has ventured hitherto to propose the establishment of concentrated control similar in every practical effect to that which the masses of Russia are at this very day struggling to lift from their stricken land. That there may be no misapprehension of the definite and resolute purpose of the Administration, we present herewith the exact words of the Secretary of State relating to the three broad propositions:

The tendency:—

"It is plainly to be seen that the people of the country are coming to the conclusion that in certain important respects the local laws of the separate States, which were adequate for the due and just regulation and control of the business which was transacted and the activity which began and ended within the limits of the several States, are inadequate for the due and just control of the business and activities which extend throughout all the States, and that power of regulation and control is gradually passing into the hands of the national Government.

"Sometimes by an assertion of the interstate commerce power, sometimes by an assertion of the taxing power, the national Government is taking up the performance of duties which under the changed conditions the separate States are no longer capable of adequately performing. The Federal anti-trust law, the anti-rebate law, the railroad-rate law, the meat-inspection law, the oleomargarine law, the pure-food law, are examples of the purpose of the people of the United States to do through the agency of the national Government the things which the separate State governments formerly did adequately, but no longer do adequately."

That the statutes specified have been enacted into law is undeniable. It is equally certain that those recently passed were driven through the legislative bodies under the whip and spur of the Federal Administration, which did not hesitate to exercise its full power of coercion and bribery through the distribution of patronage to enforce its will upon an obviously reluctant Congress. The disingenuous assertion that the enactment of such laws and the "gradual passing of control into the hands of the national Government" meet with the approval of the sober sense of the people is purely assumptive and finds no confirmation in the reduced Republican membership of the House of Representatives. It is, however, probably true that the fostering and encouragement to growth of a paternalistic spirit by an ebullient Administration have given rise to such a "tend-

ency" among unthinking persons. As to whether the drift is desirable, from the view-point of those who have in mind the future welfare of the country, the Secretary of State expresses no direct opinion. We may only surmise, therefore, whether the Administration's nourishing of such theories is justly attributable to earnest conviction or to mere pandering to mob opinion for the partisan or personal purpose of discomfiting a dangerous rival. Whatever the cause, we may admit the effect.

Further projects mooted:—

"The end is not yet. The process that interweaves the life and action of the people in every section of our country with the people in every other section continues and will continue with increasing force and effect: we are urging forward in a development of business and social life which tends more and more to the obliteration of State lines and the decrease of State power as compared with national power; the relations of the business over which the Federal Government is assuming control, of interstate transportation with State transportation, of interstate commerce with State commerce, are so intimate, and the separation of the two is so impracticable that the tendency is plainly toward the practical control of the national Government over both. New projects of national control are mooted; control of insurance, uniform divorce laws, child-labor laws and many others affecting matters formerly entirely within the cognizance of the State are proposed."

It is somewhat significant that the Secretary of State carefully refrained from fixing the responsibility for further projects of national regulation upon the people; the credit of instigation apparently is desired by an Administration which can perceive no diminution in the force of a tendency created by itself. The attitude is more manly and, if the assumption be correct, no less politic.

The threat:—

"It may be that such control could better be exercised in particular instances by the governments of the States, but the people will have the control they need either from the States or from the national Government, and if the States fail to furnish it in due measure *sooner or later constructions of the Constitution will be found to vest the power where it will be exercised—in the national Government.*"

Constructions of the Constitution are made by the Supreme Court. The justices comprising that august tribunal, designed by the fathers to hold final authority exceeding that of either the Executive or the Congress, are named by the President. One member of the cabinet, in avowed sympathy with the "tendency" noted by the Secretary of State, has just been designated; another,

it is well understood, awaits appointment as Chief Justice. A member of the great court nominated by the Chief Magistrate who voted against the contention of the Administration in a famous case was denounced as "disloyal." What are we to infer? That "constructions" of the Constitution "will be found, sooner or later," by justices of purely judicial temperament, bent solely upon correct interpretation, or by mere prejudiced puppets of the Executive arm of the Government? Having in mind the "constructive recess" of the Senate between the midnight ticks of the clock "found" by the present Secretary of State; not forgetting the subtle device by which the Administration, in flagrant violation of the treaty-making prerogative vested in the Senate, achieved and still maintains its will in San Domingo; holding fast in recollection the virtual declaration of war by inciting insurrection against Colombia; still sadly recalling the denunciation, as "wickedly absurd," of the action of American parents in refusing to admit grown Mongolians into intimate association with their little children, and a threat to employ, if necessary, "all of the forces, military and civil, of the United States" to enforce such hateful contact—are we justified in expecting that the "constructions" of the Constitution to be "found" will be precise interpretations, or must we apprehensively look forward to a succession of evasions and subversions?

"It is useless," declared the Secretary of State, "for the advocate of State rights to inveigh against the supremacy of the constitutional laws of the United States." This is worse than disingenuous; it is purely demagogic—the contemptible building of a man of straw. As the Secretary of State and his chief well know, nobody has inveighed against either the supremacy or application of "constitutional laws"; it is the adroit, avowed and, to our mind, unpatriotic and almost treasonable challenge of our fundamental law that evokes condemnation. It is also "useless," according to the Secretary of State, to inveigh "against the extension of national authority in the fields of necessary control." Against *constitutional* extension of such authority? No. To *that* there is no objection. It is the admittedly *unconstitutional* extension that makes for apprehension; that is, admittedly unconstitutional until "constructions" shall be "found." When, if ever, that sinister prophecy shall have come to pass, there will be no occasion to stand steadfastly for or inveigh against a Con-

stitution that will have become as dead as the laws of Medes and Persians.

It is pitiful to feel compelled to speak truth that is bitter. We yield to none in appreciation of the excellent intentions, despite the calculating quality of his methods, of Theodore Roosevelt. We hailed him originally as the only apparent saviour of the country from the inordinate greed of his party as represented in and controlled by the Senate. In common, we believe, with a vast majority of his fellow citizens, we have regarded with patient tolerance his numberless impulsive indiscretions, even to the recent humiliating diplomatic episode and the ridiculous attempt to effect by quasi-imperial decree a change in established form of expression. Even his latest impatient demand for the privilege of regarding all officers of the army and navy in time of peace as in a class with his household servants and subject to dishonorable discharge without necessary trial or cause, but from caprice or personal disfavor, we took lightly because of the belief, which we still entertain, that even a benumbed Congress will not endow the President of a free people with a personal authority held by no king, emperor or tsar of any civilized nation. Until now it has seemed no more than a patriotic duty to overlook lapses and deficiencies which might, after all, prove to have been immaterial in connection with a zealous endeavor to achieve the greatest good for the greatest number.

Yet stronger has been our sense of admiration and appreciation of the Secretary of State—an unquestionably great man, whose splendid service has not had and now, in our judgment, never will have, full requital. Of all minds composing this restive Administration, his at least was reckoned calm; and yet, such apparently has been the effect of the glamour of almost royal honors rendered and accepted in foreign lands, supplemented by the impressions of regal splendor conveyed by the first of American Cæsars to visit in suitable state his outlying provinces, that from the very lips of that sagacious man we receive the pronouncement, insulting to a free people, of empire.

It is not a matter of the rights of States, in spite of the fact that the Union was and is no more than a compact for mutual protection and helpfulness of sovereign bodies politic; all recognize the indubitable fact that changing conditions require elastic

adjustment of governmental jurisdiction. The question confronting the American people, following the defiance hurled by the President and Secretary of State, is simply and solely whether the Constitution is indeed the bulwark of our liberties depicted by the great Chief Justice or a mere shuttlecock in the game of politics to be tossed back and forth by a new autocracy, itself surely doomed, in turn, to be engulfed in the yawning abyss of anarchy. It is the fate, not of an individual commonwealth, but of the Republic itself, that trembles in the balance.

FRIDAY, December 14.

A Christmas Plea for Vanity.

WE question whether Solomon actually wrote or dictated the words of the preacher; it seems far more likely that, in his old age, he let his moody spirit feed upon the shrewdly pessimistic philosophy of his courtiers, and himself became the editor of epigrammatic phrases most favored, if sardonic. "Vanity of vanities, all is vanity," is the expression, not of wisdom, but of folly—a weak admission of spiritual depression unworthy of a strong character or even a trained intellect. In other books comprising the Old Testament the word, subsequently translated into the Latin *vanitas* and now into the Esperanto *vaneco*, signified a heathen god or personification of vice; but, clearly, in Ecclesiastes it was used to represent mere emptiness, indicating the futility of endeavor, as, for example, Cooper poetically defined death as reducing all to the same views of the "vanity of life," and Poe mournfully bewailed

"—the hollow and high-sounding vanities
Of the populous Earth!"

As, of course, we all know, the accepted meaning of the word changed long ago; precisely when, we cannot tell, but certainly before the frankest of philosophers argued that it was less vain than immodest in a man to speak freely of himself. To-day our latest, revised and professedly up-to-date dictionaries define vanity as (1) "a feeling of shallow pride, especially as characteristic and demonstrative, and as manifesting an overweening desire to attract notice and gain admiration in a small way on slight grounds"; (2) "mental elation arising from a high opinion of one's own attainments or achievements, or from an overestimation of possessions more showy than valuable," and (3) "inordinate self-esteem." The third interpretation we reject as an encroach-

ment upon the prerogatives of egotism and conceit; the first and second we accept as exact in the modern sense, and from that viewpoint we insist that the trait has undergone serious misrepresentation.

Vanity, as we and our modern dictionaries comprehend it, is not displeasing in manifestation. King Solomon himself would not have resented a natural effort upon the part of a child "to attract notice and gain attention in a small way on slight grounds"; though wise, he was intensely human, as we could readily demonstrate from his autobiography, and he would have entered sympathetically into the spirit of the future woman joyously exhibiting her bows of pink and blue. Moreover, while of course only well-to-do as compared with our own modern billionaires or multi-millionaires, he nevertheless possessed much gold and silver, to say nothing of an aggregation of concubines difficult of acquirement in these hypercritical days, and could appreciate the naturalness of "mental elation arising from an overestimation of possessions." And so, despite the disparity in the possession of worldly goods, can we or any fitly constructed person. An exhibition of vanity on the part of one unduly rich is but normal and no more offensive than a similar manifestation by a happy child. Even having the power, to deprive either the one or the other of the harmless personal enjoyment arising therefrom would be a surly performance, incompatible with the spirit which should predominate during the celebration of Christ's mass.

Christmas week is the time of all the year when blessings from the heart fall most bountifully upon the vast majority of humankind who work to live. To those who have so much that the most shrewdly selected gift can but add to a hopeless surfeit it is a season of comparative bitterness. They are the ones, then, most immediately in need of sympathetic commiseration, and for them, on this eve of the celebration of the Nativity, we bespeak the kindly feeling of all good people and gentle tolerance of vanities inseparable from great possessions.

SATURDAY, *December 15.*

Where Stands England?

FAR be it from us to suggest that the English are stupid; we cheerily admit the validity of their own oft-repeated assertion that their notable success as a nation forbids the use in a truthful sense of such a characterization. But we must confess that there

do come times, at rare intervals, when we are puzzled by what seems to be on their part a certain lack of comprehension of realities. This is one of those times. We are informed that they are distressed at the moment by our apparently increasing indisposition to respond, with the enthusiasm which with a certain amount of complacency they feel a right to expect from impulsive natures, to their undisguised manifestations of true friendliness. Such an attitude on our part is to their minds inexplicable, especially in view of their adulatory regard for our Chief Magistrate, whose people they have come to consider we are, as the Germans are the Kaiser's.

In the circumstances, we suppose, it is but natural that they should attach exceptional importance to the personal equation and attribute the condition they deplore to comparatively inefficient representation in Washington. Hence the difficulty and delay, we are informed, in filling the post of Ambassador about to be vacated by Sir Mortimer Durand. Nobody can be found who meets the apparent requirements of our many-sided President. James Bryce was suggested; but alas! while unquestionably holding to an exceptional degree the good-will of our people, he is, after all, only a statesman and a scholar, and wholly unversed in the noble game of tennis practised so happily on the White House courts by the Ambassador from the French Republic. Lord Curzon, too, demonstrated extraordinary capacity as Governor-General of India, and is well and favorably known in this country, in a personal sense, as one of the few titled foreigners who have proven satisfactory husbands of American wives, but he cannot ride as far or shoot as straight as the clever representative of the Kaiser. Opinion now seems to be setting strongly in favor of Lord Desborough, "the strong man of Taplow," who has shot in India, Africa and the Rockies, has rowed across the English Channel, has swum the Niagara River, and throws a beautiful fly. It may happen that, in final consideration, a bar to his appointment will be found; but, in any case, solemnly declares a prominent English journal, "What we required when the retiring envoy was appointed and what we need now is a man as little like a professional diplomat as possible." Upon this assumption, the quest will proceed. If, finally, one shall be found capable of participating with our President in the strenuous joys of physical existence, great will be

our gratification; for, surely, none stands in severer need of constant relaxation than he.

Nevertheless, we cannot rid our mind of the thought that there are other considerations, to which now, in a spirit of helpful suggestion towards our cousins, we venture to advert. Despite the stern pronouncement of the President that the refusal of citizens of San Francisco to permit grown-up Mongolians to attend the same schools where their own little girls and boys are taught is "wickedly absurd," the incident is not yet closed, and a happy settlement of the difficulty seems no nearer. We by no means share the opinion freely expressed on the Continent that a cause so trifling may lead to warfare between Japan and the United States; and yet we cannot ignore the possibility of serious trouble arising from an accumulation of irritating, and perhaps unavoidable, circumstances in the future. In such a deplorable event, we are constrained to reflect what would be the attitude towards us of Great Britain. Japan is her ally for better or for worse, without apparent regard to right, wrong or expediency. The terms of the alliance are succinctly stated in the treaty executed by the two high contracting parties on August 12th, 1905, in these words:

"Article II.—Should either of the high contracting parties be involved in war in defence of its territorial rights or special interests, the other party will at once come to the assistance of its ally, and both parties will conduct a war in common and make peace in mutual agreement with any power or powers involved in such war."

We may safely assume that, as a matter of practice if not of theory, Japan will never have occasion to resist an American invasion of its territorial rights, even though she should continue, as she has begun, to deliberately violate her pledge of an "open door" for trade in Manchuria. Whether or not such a claim as her Government sets up respecting the equal rights of her students in San Francisco comes within the purview of "special interests" is a question. Undoubtedly, that is the Japanese view, and we are deeply impressed by the fact that it is taken for granted by the eminent publicist whose authoritative judgment is expressed upon the pages of this REVIEW. True, Mr. Hazeltine surmises that the English people, for purely selfish reasons, would estop their Government from joining in such a war upon the United States, and he cites some precedents in support of his theory;

but the fact remains that, if brought face to face with the situation, Great Britain would be compelled to turn against us the full force of her great navy in response to a demand from Japan or flagrantly violate a solemn treaty obligation.

We readily admit that the assumption of an obligation so menacing to the United States was inadvertent on the part of the British Government. At the time of the execution of the treaty—during the Peace Conference at Portsmouth—the possibility of war between Japan and the United States was not within the range of contemplation, and the agreement was framed solely for the purpose of safeguarding mutual interests against Continental aggression. But it is idle now to maintain that such a contingency can be ignored. If, therefore, England would convince us of the sincerity of her professions of friendship, it is plainly evident that she should lose no time in rectifying an error, even though such error be justly attributed to inadvertence rather than to deliberation. It is not likely that Japan would be so obstinate as to refuse consent to an immediate modification of the treaty, excepting from the operation of the main provision her ally's chief source of food-supply. Whether or not His Majesty's Government, from the view-point of policy, shall consider it wise to make a diplomatic attempt to effect such a change is a question for them to decide; but there is no escape from the fact that, so long as the expressed obligation continues in force, England is, theoretically at least, in a position of willingness to be forced to make war upon the United States at the instigation of another Power. Obviously, continuance in that position is hopelessly incompatible with friendly professions, and, we say plainly, it will soon come to be regarded in this country as a wilful and serious menace to our security and welfare as a Nation.

Our earnest suggestion, therefore, to our brothers by race and lineage, towards whom, we beg to assure them, there now exist in this country only the most kindly feelings, is to turn for a moment from their search for a congenial companion for the President to the more imminent necessity of setting themselves right before the eyes of the American people.

MONDAY, December 17.

The Conquest of the Air.

It is eminently fitting that the conquest of the air, which now seems assured, should crown the achievements of this creative age.

None, if indeed all combined, of the wonderful inventions of the past century has wrought so many and so radical changes in the conditions of physical existence or is laden with such a variety of possibilities as this final mastery of the atmosphere. Long before the days of Darius Green there had appeared at intervals signs of success, only, however, to share the fate of the famous flying-machine itself; but now evidences of the solution of the physical problem that has most puzzled man from the beginning are convincing. Far more important than the guiding of balloons was the recent actual flight of Mr. Santos-Dumont's *aéroplane*, a motor air-ship buoyed by flat surfaces corresponding to the wings of a bird, for a distance of two hundred and thirty yards. Other inventors claim to have achieved more, but in private, while this experiment was in public, and the result, proving that a body heavier than the air itself could be forced through it by mechanical power, was conclusive; it remains only to lighten engines, strengthen other parts and generally perfect the machine.

But Mr. Santos-Dumont's success involved more than this mere demonstration; it chained public attention forthwith and brought forth money for experimentation and reward which had not hitherto been forthcoming. A Paris newspaper began by offering a prize of £4,000, which was increased by public subscription to £10,000, to the winner of an air-ship race from Paris to London in 1908; a London journal promptly offered £10,000 for the first flight from London to Manchester; other similar proposals have been made in both countries; and landowners have offered the free use of estates most suitable for experiment; so that Mr. Santos-Dumont's expectation that the prize for the London-Manchester flight will be won next year seems not unreasonable.

Accepting, as we must, the navigation of the air as a question only of time, what will happen when it becomes an accomplished fact? That the new system will possess some advantages over all existing means of transportation is obvious, having what might be termed plain sailing at times, and always immunity from the burdensome cost of road-beds, bridges and the like. In the matter of speed, too, it is well known that certain birds fly twice as rapidly as the fastest express train; why not the *aéroplane*, built upon the same principle? In respect to competition with

other methods of transportation, however, we opine that owners of securities of existing transportation companies need feel no apprehension. The street-car did not succumb to the elevated, the elevated to the subway, the horse to the motor, the telegraph to the telephone, nor the cable to the wireless. This growing world seems to require all facilities as rapidly as they can be supplied by the genius of man, and each addition, apparently, seems only to aid, rather than to cripple, the others, in consonance with the familiar saying of railway men that travel makes travel—that is, individual examples form a communal habit.

But what of regulations making for safety not only of passengers in the air, but of those over whose heads the air-ship must sail? In view of the difficulty experienced in the restraint of motor-cars on land, where at least they can be numbered, located and stopped, the employment of winged angels or demons as policeman would seem likely to be requisite to the maintenance of speed regulations in the sky and to the protection of the heads of people on the planet. Whether any considerable number of persons, any number, at least, of sufficient size to give commercial value to aëro-transportation, will ever utilize the method, is doubtful. It seems unnatural; apparently man was built to stand upon the ground. Strife against the force of gravity, therefore, may be regarded as contrary to the intention of the creating power; a fact which may account for the intense dislike and even fear of the majority of men and women on looking down from a great height. For this reason alone it is certain that the percentage of inhabitants of the earth who would now hazard a trip through the air is infinitesimally small. And yet a similar prejudice once prevailed against sailing on the seas; and those who climb steeples and work on high buildings seem to have demonstrated that even the distressing dizziness experienced by most of us yields readily to the potent influence of familiarity; so we really can tell very little about it, and, despite the example of the rapidity of the development, once begun, of steam and electricity, we question whether in many generations there will be reason for serious concern.

Nations are more immediately concerned than individuals. Visionary may have seemed—and, perhaps, may still seem—the anticipations of the poet, when, peering into the future far as human eye could see, in imagination he

"Saw the heavens fill with commerce, argosies of magic sails,
Pilots of the purple twilight, dropping down with costly bales;
Heard the heavens fill with shouting, and there rained a ghastly dew
From the nations' airy navies grappling in the central blue."

But even now, in war, dirigible balloons are employed. True, the air battle-ship is not readily imagined; and yet—apart from possible engagements of aerial fleets—a very small navigable aeroplane could take aloft a sufficient amount of highly explosive material to demolish a small city like New York or London. Fortunately, however, British writers have already settled in their minds that a Berne Convention will precede the fighting air-ship and limit the scope of its work, but in just what manner the heavens will be patrolled for the capture of pirates has not yet been made clear. Perhaps the necessity will not arise.

TUESDAY, December 18.

Good Women a Majority.

"All women must be enfranchised or none, and the prospect is not alluring."—*The New York Times*.

ARE there more bad women than good women in the United States? We may safely assume that such is not the contention of this distinguished journal. The "unalluring prospect," more explicitly stated, would be found to rest upon the familiar assumption that bad women will vote and good women will not vote, and that, therefore, the net effect must be injurious. There lies before us a report of the results of an inquiry into this phase of the subject in the four suffrage States. Direct questions were addressed to the judges of the Supreme Courts and presidents of universities and colleges, and the summaries presented herewith rest upon the answers received:

Kansas.—"Although women do not have full suffrage in Kansas, they have voted in municipal elections since 1887 and in school elections ever since Kansas has been a State. So their forty-five years of experience is valuable. The votes of immoral women have not appreciably influenced elections in that State. Abandoned women do not care to vote, or register, or come in contact with good women at the polls. Consequently, they rarely register if left alone.

"There have been men, however, who attempted to make use of their ballots. In the early years of municipal woman suffrage in Kansas a candidate in a place of 3,000 population fancied that he could make his election sure by the support of the immoral women of the city, and he did secure it. He promised them protection and certain immunities, and won them to his support. As soon as the respectable women of the city

heard of it, they organized to defeat him, and it was not at all hard to do. That class of women have cut no figure in Kansas elections since that experience.

"In Leavenworth, a candidate for Mayor once had the hardihood to flaunt immoral women in a procession of carriages going to the polls, expecting thus to disgust decent women with the exercise, and so induce them to remain away from the polls. But these only came out the more and taught candidates that the votes of immoral women would drive support from those who sought success at the hands of the degraded class of women voters. Candidates are now extremely anxious to keep that sort of support out of sight, but it cannot be done because these women *must register*, and close watch is kept on the registration. It is very soon known if immoral women are preparing to vote in any considerable numbers."

Utah.—"In the larger centres of population in Utah immoral women have been made use of by the saloon element to try to influence the elections, but without any appreciable effect."

Idaho.—"A good many immoral women vote, probably a majority, and their votes are cast for that which is evil if an opportunity be afforded; but the system under which they are enabled to vote has such a beneficial influence upon politics that the effect of their ballots is lost. Immoral men and immoral women both vote, and the votes of both are bad. But the votes of moral women raise the average of character represented by the ballots cast. There are so many more good women than good men that the system is highly advantageous, notwithstanding the fact that immoral women cast ballots for bad candidates. A far greater proportion of good women than of good men can be relied upon to vote for the right on questions involving moral principles. In the flood of good ballots which this gives, the bad ones are submerged."

Wyoming.—"The Wyoming Secretary of State, in a letter, says that ninety per cent. of the women of Wyoming vote, and ex-Governor Warren, of Wyoming, adds: 'Our women nearly all vote; and since, in Wyoming as elsewhere, the majority of women are good and not bad, the results are good and not evil.'"

Several years ago a statement was published that the women of Colorado voted in large numbers, and that their vote was "noticeably more conscientious than that of men." It was signed by the Governor, Governor-elect, the two ex-Governors of Colorado, by the Chief Justice and all the judges of the Supreme Court, the Denver District Court, and the Court of Appeals; by the president of the State University, the president of the Colorado College, the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, the Attorney-General, and all the Colorado Senators and Representatives in Congress, the Mayor of Denver, and a large number of prominent citizens, including eminent clergymen of

different denominations. The results of the past two years we summarized in the last number of this REVIEW. There remains to be added the testimony of Judge Lindsay of the famous Juvenile Court, who says:

"Woman suffrage in Colorado for over ten years has more than demonstrated its justice. No one would dare to propose its repeal; and, if left to the men of the State, any proposition to revoke the right bestowed upon women would be overwhelmingly defeated.

"Many good laws have been obtained in Colorado which would not have been secured but for the power and influence of women.

"At some of the elections in Denver frauds have been committed. Ninety-nine per cent. of these frauds were committed by men, without any connivance or assistance, direct or indirect, from women; but because one per cent. were committed by women, there are ignorant or careless-minded people in other States who actually argue that this is the reason for denying women the right to vote. If it were a just reason for denying suffrage to women, it would be ten times greater reason for denying it to men.

"People have no right to judge woman suffrage in Colorado by the election frauds in a few precincts, unless it would be to show why suffrage should be denied to men and restricted to women. As a matter of fact, the only blow for decency that counted in the last of a series of bad elections in Denver, was delivered by women voters; and the very important good that came out of an otherwise questionable election was the result of woman suffrage. The evil results of that election were in spite of woman suffrage; not because of it, but because of male suffrage; for had there been no men who voted at that election, and if the matter had been left entirely to women, not a corruptionist would have been elected."

Such we believe to be the facts. The reasons why prostitutes dislike to go to the polls in the broad light of day are sufficiently obvious; the last remaining pang of shame springs from contact with or proximity to chastity; it is, therefore, avoided at the polls as everywhere else. We now regard the carelessly repeated rumor of "failure of woman suffrage in Colorado" as refuted with sufficient authority to leave no room for doubt in any fair mind.

The fact that it is "in spite of, not because of," women voting that all results are not satisfactory is fully emphasised by Justice Lindsay's further statement that an effort to withdraw the franchise would be overwhelmingly defeated by men's votes alone. Is not this invariably the case? Has the privilege of voting once bestowed upon women ever been revoked?

WEDNESDAY, *December 19.*

Let Those Who Wed Put Asunder!

WE must regard the President's declaration that "the whole question of marriage and divorce should be relegated to the authority of the National Congress," not as a definitive official recommendation, but as a mere expression of personal opinion. Being "aware of the difficulty" of enacting a constitutional amendment, however generally desired, he must recognize that in this case the difficulty amounts to virtual impossibility. Theoretically, each State is satisfied with its laws relating to divorce as they now stand; and, practically, despite appreciation of the evils resulting from diversity of regulations, probably not one-fourth, and surely not the requisite three-fourths, of the States could be induced to relinquish authority to the Federal Congress. It is inconceivable, for example, that South Carolina, which prohibits divorcement entirely, or New York, which concedes but the one cause, infidelity, would blindly expunge the existing statutes in favor of others to be made by representatives of sister States holding quite different views. Nor, on the other hand, can we suppose that South Dakota would readily submit to the dictation of South Carolina or New York. It is idle, therefore, to discourse upon either the probable advantages or disadvantages of national legislation, and far more to the point to seek a remedy that may be practicable, even if only partial. One sensible suggestion has been made, to the effect that the real need "is not a general law providing what shall be the causes for an absolute divorce in all parts of the country, but the adoption by the several States of a general rule which shall prohibit the courts of the State from granting any divorce except in cases where the defendant is an actual resident of the State, or has been served with process within the territorial limits of the State." We are disposed to think that a simpler and more efficacious method would be the adoption of a general rule prescribing that only the State by whose authority two persons are wed shall thereafter put them asunder. The divorcement of a couple then by any State other than that wherein they were married would not be recognized in commonwealths subscribing to the rule, so that in practical effect an attempt on the part of one, two or half a dozen small States to maintain the present advantages of a Gretna Green would be futile.